

**From:** Peter McDonald  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/28/02 12:25pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft PFJ Comments.

To whom it may concern, <mailto:microsoft.atr@usdoj.gov>

As a consumer of Microsoft products as well as a business professional in the software industry I would like to add a few important comments concerning the proposed final judgment between the US DOJ and Microsoft. Simply put the proposed settlement does very little to address the three items listed by the US Court of Appeals. Hence, my recommendation is that the PFJ proposal in its current form is not acceptable. I ask that the DOJ needs to address the three key components listed unanimously by the U.S. Court of Appeals ruling. Specifically, to

- \* terminate Microsoft's legal monopoly
- \* deny Microsoft the fruits of its past violations
- \* prevent future anticompetitive activity.

As an observer and professional in the software world I define Microsoft's mantra to be one of domination. Over the past few decades Microsoft has uses both legal and illegal practices to attain their goal of domination. If the current PFJ is accepted, I'm left with two questions.

First, does the DOJ's definition of effective anti-trust work include the supporting of monopolies? Second, is the precedent for dealing with companies with a track record of violating anti-trust laws to condone their track record of violations? I hope the answer to both questions are no. As such I ask that the current PFJ be updated to include the three items unanimously decreed by the US Court of Appeals.

It is great to be an American where each individual has a voice. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Regards,

Peter McDonald

---

Peter McDonald  
Director  
VerdiSoft  
Palo Alto, CA  
650 812-8511 office

<mailto:peter.mcdonald@verdisoft.com> peter.mcdonald@verdisoft.com

**CC:** microsoftcomments@doj.ca.gov@inetgw, Peter McDonald